

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-21 have been canceled in favor of new claims 24-28. Support for the subject matter of claims 24-28 is provided for example in the original claims and the specification at page 25, line 27, through page 26, line 15. (It should be noted that references herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.)

Claims 1-12 and 17-21 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Shohara et al. (US 6,804,503) in view of Du et al. (US 6,556,576). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Shohara et al. (US 6,804,503) in view of Du et al. (US 6,556,576) and Kawano et al. (US 4,926,421). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Shohara et al. (US 6,804,503) in view of Du et al. (US 6,556,576) and Koo et al. (US 7,269,145). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to new claims 24-28, the Applicants respectfully traverse based on the points set forth below.

Claim 24 defines an intermittent communication method in which a communication terminal apparatus, upon receiving a NACK signal from a communication terminal accommodation apparatus, performs a retransmission in an intermittent communication mode. The claimed subject matter provides an advantage of maintaining power-saving operations in an intermittent communication mode and saving communicated data through retransmissions,

thereby reducing the probability of discarding packets and improving the efficiency of transmission (see specification page 2, lines 15-19, and page 26, lines 6-15).

The Office Action acknowledges that neither Shohara nor Du discloses performing a retransmission operation in response to receiving a NACK signal (see Office Action section 8, lines 1-7). In an attempt to overcome this deficiency, the Office Action relies on Koo as allegedly disclosing adding a retransmission frame when a NACK is received (see section 8, lines 7-10).

Even if it were assumed *arguendo* that Koo may disclose adding a retransmission frame when a NACK is received, as proposed in the Office Action, Koo does not disclose carrying out a retransmission in an intermittent communication mode, upon receiving a NACK signal, as recited in the Applicants' claim 24.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the teachings of Shohara, Du and Koo, fail to achieve all of the features of instant claim 24, and thus, these applied references, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter defined by claim 24.

Independent claims 26 and 28 similarly recite the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing method claim 24 from Shohara, Du and Koo, but do so with respect to apparatuses.

Therefore, allowance of claims 24, 26, and 28 and all claims dependent therefrom is deemed to be warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: June 15, 2009  
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter  
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-04191  
Dickinson Wright PLLC  
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 659-6966  
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559